

1                                   **THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC LIBRARY**  
2                                   **CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION BOARD MINUTES**

3  
4                                   **CalEPA Building**  
5                                   **1001 I Street**  
6                                   **Central Valley Room**  
7                                   **Sacramento, California 95814**  
8                                   **December 2, 2002**  
9

10  
11                   **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

12                   Dr. Kevin Starr, State Librarian of California, convened the meeting on December 2,  
13 2002, at 3:24 p.m. The following Board members were present:

14                   Senator Dede Alpert; Treasurer Philip Angelides; Assemblymember Ellen Corbett;  
15 Barton “Bart” P. Pachino, Esq.; and Ms. Annette Porini, representing the Director of Finance.

16                   Before beginning the meeting, Dr. Starr introduced former Senator Richard Rainey,  
17 the author of the Library Bond Act of 2000, acknowledging the importance of his action.

18                   Dr. Starr stated the purpose of the meeting was to award grants in the first phase of  
19 the Library Bond Act grant program, up to the amount of \$150,000,000, choosing among the  
20 61 applications evaluated by the Office of Library Construction.

21                   **APPROVAL OF MAY 9, 2002, BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

22                   *It was moved, seconded (Corbett/Pachino), and carried unanimously that the*  
23 *California Public Library Construction and Renovation Board approve the minutes*  
24 *of the May 9, 2002, meeting.*  
25

26                   **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

27                   *Mr. Angelides moved that the California Public Library Construction and*  
28 *Renovation Board adopt the agenda with the modification of moving public*  
29 *comment prior to grant award decision, and it carried unanimously.*  
30  
31

1 **OVERVIEW OF THE STAFF REVIEW OF FIRST CYCLE LIBRARY BOND ACT**  
2 **APPLICATIONS**  
3

4 Before moving on to consideration of grant awards, Dr. Starr acknowledged Mr.  
5 Angelides who thanked the staff for their work in reviewing the applications and providing  
6 the Board Members with information for their deliberations. He also pointed out the high  
7 quality of projects from throughout the state. Dr. Starr asked Mr. Hall to continue with the  
8 presentation. Mr. Hall expressed appreciation to the CalEPA staff for being able to meet in  
9 the Central Valley Room and encouraged attendees to visit the CalEPA library.

10 Mr. Hall briefly described the eligibility review for the first cycle of grant  
11 applications, which resulted in five ineligible applications out of the 66 submitted. One of  
12 the eligibility requirements is the submittal of evidence of CEQA completion, and Mr. Hall  
13 indicated that the Board is in receipt of completed CEQA documentation for each of the  
14 eligible applications.

15 Mr. Hall said that during the application review, staff discovered a few ambiguities in  
16 the regulations, and to correct the ambiguities, staff is proposing changes without regulatory  
17 effect.

18 Mr. Hall described the process used by the staff in evaluating applications, indicating  
19 that the basis of the evaluation was the seven factors detailed in the Bond Act. He indicated  
20 that four Office of Library Construction professional staff members each completed an in-  
21 depth review of each application before determining an overall application rating. Prior to  
22 presentation to the Board, the Deputy Library Bond Act Manager, Mr. Hall, and the Deputy  
23 State Librarian reviewed the staff findings and project summaries. The Bond Act Fiscal  
24 Officer also reviewed the application budgets, comparing them to the construction cost  
25 estimate to ensure consistency among documents..

1 Mr. Hall thanked Dr. Starr and the Board for creating an environment devoid of  
2 outside influence concerning application ratings.

3 Mr. Hall noted that in the Office of Library Construction staff findings, a listing of all  
4 projects grouped by the five rating categories, only the top three categories contained  
5 applications due to the high quality of the applications received. He indicated that all of the  
6 projects are “eminently fundable and deserving of funding.”

7 He indicated that the individual two-page summaries present an overview of the staff  
8 comments and ratings. He explained that the full application evaluation forms are available  
9 at the Office of Library Construction, and he indicated that requests for copies of evaluations  
10 and for staff consultations may be made by contacting the Office of Library Construction by  
11 phone or e-mail.

12 Linda Springer, Deputy Library Bond Act Manager, provided additional detail  
13 concerning the evaluation process. She discussed the Bond Act review factors and  
14 summarized how the applications were reviewed and evaluated in relation to them. Ms.  
15 Springer briefly explained the evaluation process and how overall ratings were determined.  
16 She indicated that the high quality of the applications received speaks well of California’s  
17 public library community.

18

19 **PROPOSED CHANGES WITHOUT REGULATORY EFFECT TO TITLE 5**

20

21 Ms. Springer introduced the next topic, the proposed changes without regulatory  
22 effect to the Title 5 regulations, and the Board was ready to take action on the item. Before  
23 action was taken, Ms. Springer mentioned that staff has an additional recommendation, the

1 deletion of extraneous wording to further clarify the section related to submittal of a  
2 preliminary title report.

3 ***It was moved, seconded (Angelides /Pachino), and carried unanimously that the***  
4 ***California Public Library Construction and Renovation Board accept staff***  
5 ***recommendations concerning changes without regulatory effect to the Title 5***  
6 ***Library Bond Act Regulations.***  
7

8 Dr. Starr began the process by asking Board members for suggestions of an approach  
9 to be taken considering grant award decisions. Senator Alpert indicated she was impressed  
10 with all of the applications and unhappy that there is not sufficient money to fund all of them.  
11 Suggestions and discussion for initial grant award considerations:

- 12 ▪ Funding all first priority applications in the “Outstanding” category – Alpert
- 13 ▪ Funding all first priority applications in the “Outstanding” category, excluding Newport
- 14 Beach [*Mariners Joint Use Library*] due to negative public comment, possible lesser
- 15 need compared to other applications, and limited grant resources – Pachino

16 Assemblymember Corbett agreed, saying that not funding Newport Beach might enable  
17 the community to work through issues causing opposition.

18 Mr. Angelides asked for clarification concerning the “Outstanding” rating in light of a  
19 1995 building renovation. Mr. Hall explained that renovation is only one element of  
20 the rating concerning the age and condition of an existing library. The rating for the  
21 Newport Beach application indicates that the age and condition of the library is very  
22 poor, based on staff’s review of in-depth application documentation, including the  
23 visual record.

24 Mr. Angelides asked staff about the specifics of the demographics for the Newport  
25 Beach service area. Ms. Springer pointed out that since the Bond Act specifies  
26 consideration of how well the applicant ascertained the needs of the community and  
27 met those needs in the proposed project. The Newport Beach application is for a new  
28 co-located library project, and the current school library is located in a temporary  
29 facility. Dr. Starr pointed out that while co-located joint use is the source of the  
30 community controversy, the Bond Act gives first priority to joint use.

31 Mr. Pachino pointed out that the population growth for the Newport Beach area is 30%,  
32 which is less than other project areas.

33 Senator Alpert indicated that she liked the Newport Beach project because it is co-  
34 located, which is something she has been advocating from the beginning, and that it is  
35 also rated “Outstanding.” She asked those present from Newport Beach to comment  
36 during the public comment period concerning the community controversy over the  
37 project.

1 Ms. Porini asked for clarification concerning disposition of un-funded first cycle  
2 applications. Mr. Hall indicated that they would not be automatically moved to the  
3 second cycle but would need to be resubmitted. There would be no disadvantage to  
4 such a project.

5 Mr. Angelides asked if staff had an indication of the number of projects to expect  
6 during the second and third cycles. Mr. Hall indicated that it is possible the between 80  
7 and 100 applications could be submitted, including resubmitted, un-funded first cycle  
8 applications.

- 9 ▪ Mr. Pachino suggested that communities where there is no existing library seem to be  
10 in greater need of support than a community where there has been opposition to the  
11 project and one that has not grown extensively, such as Newport Beach.
- 12 ▪ Assemblymember Corbett pointed out that if the Board wishes to fund other “Very  
13 Good” applications, money will have to be made available in order to accomplish that.  
14 Some of the “Very Good” applications are in areas that have experienced relatively  
15 larger population growth, which should also be taken into consideration.  
16

17 Dr. Starr asked California State Library General Counsel Paul Smith if it would be  
18 required for the Board to vote to approve a single slate of applications or if they could vote in  
19 phases. Mr. Smith indicated that either method would be appropriate, and further indicated  
20 that the Board might want to consider public comment about each of them.

21 Dr. Starr summarized the discussion and Board sentiment to that point: to fund  
22 “Outstanding” first priority applications with an open question concerning Newport Beach  
23 [*Mariners Joint Use Library*], and he suggested moving to the next phase of grant award  
24 determinations.

25 Mr. Pachino suggested that the grant amounts for the “Outstanding” first priority  
26 applications, with the exception of Newport Beach, be entered on a spreadsheet and projected  
27 so that the remaining funds could be determined and viewed by the Board. It was decided to  
28 remove both second priority new and remodeling projects from the calculations at that point.

29 Additional suggestions and discussion concerning initial grant award considerations:

- 30 ▪ Consider more equitable allocation between Northern and Southern California –  
31 Assemblymember Corbett with Ms. Porini concurring

- 1       ▪ Include Redding to aid the balance between the north and south – Ms. Porini
- 2        Though he believes the Redding project to be “terrific,” Mr. Pachino did not agree that
- 3       it should be added at this point, because it is based on future population growth while
- 4       other applications represent communities where significant population growth has
- 5       already occurred.
- 6       ▪ Add Fairfield, Temecula, and Lemon Grove projects because outstanding need has been
- 7       demonstrated and because there is no library in those communities – Mr. Pachino
- 8       ▪ Continue to consider Redding because it is an emergent population in a emergent part
- 9       of California and is “a metropolitan hub for a significant portion of Northern
- 10      California.” It would not serve the essential unity of the state if the Board does not
- 11      fund grants in upstate California – Dr. Starr
- 12      ▪ Ask staff to come back to the Board after a one- or two-week period with what they
- 13      think is the best systematic approach to allocate the remaining grant funds for the first
- 14      cycle. – Mr. Angelides
- 15      ▪ Fund Temecula due to its “huge growth;” Logan Heights because it serves “some of the
- 16      poorest children in the county;” Lemon Grove because there is no current library; Julian
- 17      because it is rural; Frazier Park as a rural facility; San Leandro in the north, Fairfield
- 18      Cordelia in the north; and North Torrance in the Los Angeles area with the objective
- 19      being to fund many sites as possible and include rural project applications – Senator
- 20      Alpert
- 21      ▪ Fund Fairfield Cordelia from Northern California; and Temecula and Lemon Grove
- 22      from Southern California. He has no objections to the Mariners project or the Redding
- 23      project, but the others have demonstrated “an outstanding need for a facility.” – Mr.
- 24      Pachino

25

26           Mr. Angelides asked Dr. Starr his view on how to proceed. Dr. Starr said he would

27 be reluctant to omit Northern California from funding because it would send the wrong

28 message regarding the “indivisibility of California and the interdependence of all

29 Californians.” He would support funding the Redding project for these reasons.

30           Mr. Angelides asked that the total amount of the grant funds for the applications

31 proposed by Senator Alpert, with the addition of Redding, be calculated. *[Sen. Alpert’s list:*

32 *Lemon Grove, Temecula, Logan Heights, Frazier Park, Manor Library (San Leandro),*

33 *Fairfield Cordelia, Julian, North Torrance]*

34           Suggestion to add to the list to be awarded:

- 1       ▪ Add Castro Valley as a Northern California project to balance against Southern  
2       California projects and as a project with high population growth projections –  
3       Assemblymember Corbett

4

5           After completing the calculations, the state grant amounts exceeded the \$150 million  
6       available for the first cycle of funding, and it was clarified that the Board may not exceed  
7       \$150 million in grant awards.

8           Suggestions and discussion to bring grant awards within \$150 million:

- 9       ▪ Eliminate Temecula from the list under consideration and retain Logan Heights, Lemon  
10      Grove, Julian, San Leandro, Fairfield Cordelia, North Torrance, Frazier Park, and  
11      Redding to bring the state grant amount within \$150 million. – Treasurer Angelides
- 12      ▪ Retain Temecula based on the criteria that it has no current library facility and that it  
13      has the greatest population increase. Eliminate North Torrance and one other in order  
14      to retain Temecula. – Mr. Pachino
- 15      ▪ Questions giving preference to new communities such a Temecula with new needs  
16      precipitated by growth at the expense of long-standing, poor urban communities where  
17      need has been accumulating for a longer period, such as Barrio Logan. – Treasurer  
18      Angelides
- 19      ▪ Temecula has a population increase of over 4000% compared to North Torrance, which  
20      has shown minimal growth. – Mr. Pachino
- 21      ▪ Compute the grant amounts with North Torrance eliminated [*List: Lemon Grove,*  
22      *Temecula, Logan Heights, Frazier Park, Manor Library (San Leandro), Fairfield*  
23      *Cordelia, Julian, Redding, Castro Valley*]. – Senator Alpert

24

25           Calculations showed that grant amounts would exceed the limit by \$2 million.

26           Mr. Angelides asked the Board to keep in mind that existing communities dealing  
27       with infill have fewer options than communities where undeveloped land is available. He  
28       indicated that it is more difficult for urban infill communities to find local funds due to the  
29       lack of developer fees and Mello-Roos districts.

1           Mr. Pachino pointed out that libraries not funded in the first cycle could reapply in the  
2 next cycle, stressing his belief that in the first cycle of funding, projects in communities  
3 where no library exists should be given priority over those where there is an existing library.

4           Mr. Angelides asked for clarification regarding the presence or absence of a library in  
5 Temecula. Mr. Hall indicated that there is a county branch library serving the area but that  
6 the application is for a main library facility that would serve a much larger area than a branch  
7 library can.

8           Dr. Starr asked Mr. Pachino if he felt that Temecula would be discouraged from re-  
9 applying if it did not receive a grant award in the first cycle. Mr. Pachino indicated that he  
10 viewed it as a matter of timing and that the Board would not be indicating an application  
11 would never be funded, but that it was not being funded in the current cycle. Mr. Pachino  
12 and Mr. Angelides agreed that their solutions are based on different approaches to achieving  
13 equity.

14           Senator Alpert called for public comment. The following speakers were heard. *[A*  
15 *transcript of the full speaker comments are available on the Office of Library Construction*  
16 *Web page: [www.olc.library.ca.gov/](http://www.olc.library.ca.gov/)]*

- 17       ▪ Yukio Kawatani spoke on behalf of Bruggemeyer Library project in Monterey Park
- 18       ▪ Don Webb, newly elected city council member for the City of Newport Beach, on  
19       behalf of the Mariners Joint Use Library project
- 20       ▪ Linda Wood, Alameda County Librarian, on behalf of Castro Valley Library project
- 21       ▪ Sue Rainey, Mayor of the City of Walnut Creek on behalf of Walnut Creek project
- 22       ▪ Mark Paulson, Mayor of the City of Alhambra on behalf of the Alhambra City Library  
23       project
- 24       ▪ Matthew Hayden on behalf of the City of Calabasas Public Library project
- 25       ▪ Raymond Bragg, Redevelopment and Special Projects Director for the City of Fontana  
26       on behalf of Fontana Library project



- 1       ▪ Diane Chagnon, city council member for the City of Azusa, on behalf of Azusa Library  
2       project
- 3       ▪ Nancy Wright on behalf of the Castro Valley project
- 4       ▪ Leslie Payne, Principal Librarian for the Monterey County Free Libraries, on behalf of  
5       the Marina Library project
- 6       ▪ Nora Jacob, Library Director for the City of Orange Public Library, on behalf of the  
7       Orange Main Library project

8

9           Pausing the public comments, Senator Alpert asked staff to clarify the priorities of

10   existing library remodeling projects in relation to implementing joint use agreements with

11   school districts. Mr. Hall reviewed the Bond Act priorities related to first and second

12   priorities for new library projects and for remodeled existing library projects, indicating that

13   joint use is not a requirement for either first or second priority remodeling projects.

14           Barbara Lloyd, speaking on behalf of Treasurer Angelides, who had left the meeting

15   briefly, asked if regulations prevent the Board from funding second priority projects before

16   funding first priority projects, and Mr. Hall said they do not. He also said that the Board

17   indicated in an earlier meeting that they would not necessarily fund all first priority projects

18   before funding second priority projects.

19           Public comments resumed:

- 20       ▪ Paul Roberts, Chairman of the Vallejo Library Advisory Board, on behalf of the  
21       Springstowne Library project
- 22       ▪ Mary Hill, Assistant City Manager for the City of Vallejo on behalf of the  
23       Springstowne Library project
- 24       ▪ Steve Tate, city council member from the City of Morgan Hill, on behalf of Morgan  
25       Hill project

26

27           Dr. Starr interjected that Office of Library Construction staff will assist applicants on

28   an equal basis in suggesting improvements to their applications.

29           Public comments resumed:

1       ▪ Ron Roberts, Mayor of Temecula, on behalf of the Temecula Library project  
2       Mr. Pachino interjected that the Temecula project is the only Riverside project on the  
3 current list for initial funding consideration.

4       Public comments resumed:

- 5       ▪ Suzanne Crowell, former Mayor of the City of San Marino, on behalf of the San  
6 Marino project  
7       ▪ Jim Madaffer, city council member for the City of San Diego, on behalf of the San  
8 Diego Central Library and Logan Heights Library projects  
9       ▪ Vince Filutze, city council member and former mayor of the City of San Marino on  
10 behalf of the San Marino Library project

11

12       Mr. Hall responded to a question from Mr. Filutze concerning the consideration of the  
13 urban and rural review factor. He indicated that since the Board had been unable to  
14 determine a definition of “urban” and “rural” during rulemaking activities, Board members  
15 would take into consideration the needs of both urban and rural areas from their individual  
16 perspectives while making funding decisions.

17       In response to Mr. Filutze’s concern that the low population growth rate for San  
18 Marino seemed to indicate that it might not be funded even in future grant award cycles, Paul  
19 Smith, General Counsel for the California State Library responded by saying that areas with  
20 low population growth would not score as high as areas with higher growth rates. Dr. Starr  
21 indicated that it is still possible for any project to be funded.

22       Dr. Starr responded to Mr. Filutze’s question about consideration of socio-economic  
23 composition as grant award factors by saying that it is not included in the Bond Act and was  
24 not part of the evaluation process, but that individual Board members have the right to  
25 express their individual concerns and values.

26       Public comments resumed:

- 1       ▪ Linda Wilson, on behalf of the Bruggemeyer Library project in Monterey Park
- 2       ▪ Lenore Masterson, citizen chairman of the Marina Larger Library Committee, on behalf
- 3       of the Marina Library project
- 4       ▪ Unidentified Speaker from the City of Tustin on behalf of the Tustin Library project
- 5       ▪ Jim Buckley, City Librarian for Torrance, on behalf of the North Torrance Library
- 6       project
- 7       ▪ Diana Ingersoll, Director of Public Works for the City of Seaside, on behalf of the
- 8       Seaside Library project
- 9       ▪ Greg Nordbak, city council member and former mayor for the City of Whittier, on
- 10      behalf of Whittier Library project

11

12           Mr. Nordbak expressed concern that there were lobbyists representing some cities and  
13 other cities had no lobbyist, which creates inequity. Dr. Starr reminded him that no lobbyist  
14 approached either himself or the Office of Library Construction staff.

15           Public comments resumed:

- 16       ▪ Nicky Stanke, Director of Library Services for Stockton-San Joaquin County Public
- 17       Library on behalf of Central Valley library projects
- 18       ▪ Darlene Gaetano, Assistant City Librarian for the City of Newport Beach on behalf of
- 19       the Mariners Joint Use Library project
- 20       ▪ Susan Hildreth, City Librarian for the City of San Francisco Public Library, on behalf
- 21       of the Excelsior Branch Library project
- 22       ▪ Steve Houx, Parks and Recreation Director for the City of Manteca on behalf of the
- 23       Manteca Library project
- 24       ▪ Unidentified Female, community college student, on behalf of the Springtowne
- 25       Library project

26

27           Having heard all the comments from the public, Dr. Starr proposed that as a result of  
28 hearing the public comment, the Board consider funding all of the applications with the  
29 overall rating of “Outstanding,” which would include both new and remodeling projects, and  
30 to consider allocating the remaining funds from the \$150 million in a manner that would  
31 include urban and rural projects, as well as a geographic distribution of projects.

1 Senator Alpert indicated that, having heard public comments regarding the nature of  
2 the remodeling project parameters and the applicant's lack of control over becoming a first  
3 priority application, she was in agreement with funding the two applications for the  
4 remodeling projects that have an overall rating of "Outstanding." She said she felt  
5 differently about the second priority new library project, because determination of applying  
6 as a first priority application was in the control of the applicant. Ms. Porini expressed  
7 agreement with Dr. Starr and Senator Alpert, adding that public comments convinced her that  
8 the concept of regionalism should not be considered. Mr. Pachino indicated his support of  
9 funding the "Outstanding" list, minus Calabasas [*the second priority new library project*].  
10 He added that he would recommend allocating the remaining funds to the Temecula,  
11 Fairfield, and Lemon Grove projects, which would bring the allocations close to the \$150  
12 million limit.

13 Mr. Angelides, having rejoined the Board, asked for clarification concerning the  
14 second priority remodeling projects and their relationship to joint use, and Senator Alpert  
15 provided clarification. With that clarification, Mr. Angelides concurred with the suggestion  
16 to fund all "Outstanding" applications, minus the Calabasas project.

17 Mr. Angelides outlined the three options he saw on how to proceed in determining the  
18 disposition of the remaining first cycle funds: not allocate the funds, but carry the balance  
19 over; call a specially-noticed meeting in approximately two weeks to allocate the remaining  
20 funds; or determine applications in the "Very Good" overall evaluation category at the  
21 current meeting. He expressed his preference for convening a meeting in two weeks. A vote  
22 at the current meeting would require coming to consensus concerning the allocation of the  
23 remaining funds, blending the policy concerns of the Board members.

1           Mr. Pachino indicated that his proposal to fund the three projects [*Temecula,*  
2   *Fairfield, and Lemon Grove*] was based on the theme of “no existing library.” Mr. Angelides  
3   indicated that his policy views center on site features, transit, and community revitalization  
4   within the regulatory framework.

5           Dr. Starr indicated he was uncertain what further information the staff could provide  
6   within their roles and that he was hopeful that the policy issues could be decided by the  
7   Board, which is comprised of experienced individuals who are elected officials, government  
8   officials, and from the private sector. Staff could present to the Board scenarios with a  
9   variety of mathematical combinations that would allocate the remaining approximately \$19  
10   million.

11          Mr. Angelides indicated that the Board could roll the amount over or defer the  
12   decision for two weeks, with the latter allowing Board members time to absorb the  
13   information. He went on to explain how the decision process occurs with other entities with  
14   which he is involved.

15          Senator Alpert indicated a preference for considering other funding scenarios before  
16   deciding whether to roll the remaining funds over to be awarded in the third cycle. Mr. Hall  
17   said that the staff is limited in what additional information could be provided but could look  
18   at aspects such as urban/rural and population growth percentages. Mr. Pachino indicated that  
19   the Board was asking the staff to rank the projects within the “Very Good” and  
20   “Outstanding” rating categories, but he was doubtful than anything else could be done by the  
21   staff.

22          Assemblymember Corbett voiced agreement for the Board to reconvene later in the  
23   month to review the remaining projects due to the time and expense invested by the

1 applicants. If additional projects can be funded, it would save them the expense of re-  
2 applying.

3 Mr. Angelides suggested the Board might want to act on the first set of grant award  
4 decisions *[all first and second priority "Outstanding" applications, minus Calabasas]* before  
5 taking action concerning a future Board meeting. Seeing a consensus to take action on the  
6 first set of grant awards, Dr. Starr presented Mr. Angelides with suggested wording from the  
7 General Counsel concerning grant award decisions.

8 ***It was moved, seconded (Angelides/Alpert) that the California Public Library***  
9 ***Construction and Renovation Board:***

10  
11 ***Make grant award for those project applications that were ranked***  
12 ***"Outstanding," with the exception of Calabasas Public Library [See***  
13 ***appended list]; and***

14  
15 ***Authorize the Office of Library Construction to file CEQA Notices of***  
16 ***Determination for each project on behalf of the Board as a responsible***  
17 ***agency, and to execute grant agreements between the California State***  
18 ***Library and the grant recipients for those projects which were previously***  
19 ***noted; and***

20  
21 ***To call a meeting of the Board before Christmas to consider the potential***  
22 ***allocation of the remaining approximately \$19 million available in Round 1,***  
23 ***to additional projects.***

24  
25 In discussion prior to the vote, Mr. Angelides asked the staff to bring to the Board  
26 options for consideration, if possible. Dr. Starr assured Mr. Angelides that recommendations  
27 would be presented to assist the Board in its final decision.

28 Mr. Angelides added that he has read each of the letters he received and that he  
29 appreciates them.

30 Mr. Pachino asked if the representative from Calabasas was still present and if he  
31 would comment on the action about to be taken. Mr. Hayden indicated appreciation for the  
32 difficulty of the situation but that it felt unfair to remove the Calabasas project from the first

1 set of grant awards. He indicated that with an “Outstanding” rating, Calabasas is rated higher  
2 than any other project the Board will be considering for funding from the remaining funds for  
3 this cycle. He asked that the Board reconsider the decision. Mr. Angelides said that  
4 Calabasas is not precluded from being considered during the next weeks for funding in the  
5 first funding cycle.

6 *The motion was called by Mr. Angelides and carried unanimously.*

7  
8 Assemblymember Corbett commented that the Board may want to re-examine criteria  
9 to ensure that renovation projects are not at a disadvantage over new library projects.

10 **Adjournment**

11 Dr. Starr adjourned the meeting at 6:24 p.m. in honor of Senator Rainey, thanking  
12 him for doing the project.

13  
14 Respectfully submitted,

15  
16  
17  
18 

---

Linda Springer, Deputy Library Bond Act Manager

19  
20 Dated: December 17, 2002

21 Adopted:

22





**California Public Library Construction and Renovation Board**  
**December 2, 2002 Grant Awards**

Project Number	Project Name	Applicant	Operating Library Jurisdiction	Project Type	Project Priority	Project Square Footage	% Pop. Increase 1980-2020	State Grant Amount	Total Project Amount
1008	Alameda Main Library (Alameda Free Library)	Alameda, City of	Alameda Free Library	New Library	1st	47,470	25%	15,487,952	23,999,709
1042	Bruggemeyer Memorial Library (Monterey Park) Expansion & Renovation	Monterey Park, City of	Bruggemeyer Memorial Park (Monterey Park)	Remodel & Expansion	2nd	53,237	33%	8,845,850	13,869,000
1003	Camarillo Library	Camarillo, City of	County of Ventura	New Library	1st	65,621	116%	15,621,473	24,558,036
1047	Haskett Branch Library	Anaheim, City of	Anaheim Public Library	New Library	1st	24,000	66%	\$5,669,872	\$8,722,880
1018	Hercules Public Library	Hercules, City of	Contra Costa County Library	New Library	1st	20,492	323%	6,177,681	10,174,889
1023	Highland Branch Library & Environmental Learning Center	Highland, City of	San Bernardino County Library	New Library	1st	30,016	207%	5,165,070	8,236,262
1038	Mariners Joint Use Library	Newport Beach, City of	Newport Beach Public Library	New Library	1st	15,125	30%	3,180,739	5,133,945
1028	National City Public Library	National City, City of	National City Public Library	New Library	1st	48,998	21%	11,112,814	17,406,637
1041	Orange (City) Main Library Expansion	Orange, City of	Orange Public Library	Remodel & Expansion	2nd	45,000	53%	9,127,700	16,537,616
1016	San Mateo Main Library	San Mateo, City of	San Mateo Public Library	New Library	1st	93,800	39%	20,000,000	61,441,516
1043	Santa Maria Public Library	Santa Maria, City of	Santa Maria Public Library	New Library	1st	60,825	176%	16,390,502	25,312,657
1024	South Oxnard Branch Library	Oxnard, City of	Oxnard Public Library	New Library	1st	23,000	74%	5,785,761	9,717,862
1030	Victoria Gardens Library	Rancho Cucamonga, City of	Rancho Cucamonga Library	New Library	1st	26,863	193%	7,752,688	13,726,212